

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 31-52 are currently being cancelled. Claims 60-75 are being added as new claims.

This amendment deletes and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 53-75 are now pending in this application with claims 53-59 being withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 38 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claims 38 and 46 making the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 47-48 making the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 32-35, 38, 40-43, 46, 48, 50 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,773,344 (“Gabai”). In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claims 32-35, 38, 40-43, 46, 48, 50

and 52 making the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 31, 39, 47, 49 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,641 (“Coorman”). Claims 36 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabai in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,318 (“Kojima”). Claims 37 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,011 (“Uwakubo”).

In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claims 31, 32, 39, 40 and 47-52 making the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 60 to 75 have been added as new claims to further define the invention. No new matter has been added. Support for new claims 60-75 can be found at least on pages 7-43 of the application as filed and in the original claims as filed.

Previous Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicants respectfully submit that Gabai does not describe each and every element of new claims 60-75. Applicants rely on M.P.E.P. § 2131, entitled “Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e)” which states, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

Independent claim 60 is directed to a method of processing information, comprising in addition to other steps “analyzing inputted text to determine information to be added; and adding the information to the inputted text; and outputting the inputted text to which the information is added.” (emphasis added). Independent claims 67, 73, 74 and 75 recite similar limitations. For example, claim 67 recites “analyzing the inputted text to determine information to be added and adding the information to the inputted text,” claim 73 recites “a

process of analyzing the inputted text to determine information to be added,” claim 74 recites “analyzing the inputted text to determine information to be added,” and claim 75 recites “an information changing unit for analyzing the text translated to the second language, determining information to be added on the basis of the analysis result.”

Accordingly, the claimed method, device and systems help achieve smooth communication by transmitting additional information, as well as the result of information processing. The claimed method, device and systems can also enhance the quality of communication by adding appropriate detail information to the result of information processing.

In contrast, Gabai does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claims 60, 67, 73, 74 and 75. Gabai is directed to a method and apparatus for integration of interactive toys with interactive television and cellular communications systems. However, Gabai fails to disclose, teach or suggest “analyzing inputted text to determine information to be added” as claimed in independent claim 60.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states that “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *See In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Here, Gabai fails to disclose each and every limitation in as complete detail as is contained in amended independent claims 60, 67, 73, 74 and 75.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that independent claims 60, 67, 73, 74 and 75 be allowed. Further, claims 61-66 and 68-72 depend from one of claims 60 or 67 and should be allowed for the reasons set forth above.

Previous Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As set forth above, Gabai fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 60, 67, 73, 74 and 75. Specifically, Gabai fails to disclose, teach or suggest “analyzing inputted text to determine information to be added” as claimed. Further,

Coorman, Kojima, Uwakubo and/or fail to cure the deficiencies of Gabai. Accordingly, Applicants request that the new claims be allowed.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/29/08

By W. Keith Robinson

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

W. Keith Robinson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,396